DETAILED ACTION

Claims 25-43 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Balasubramaniam** et al. (USPN 6,477,550) in view of **Platt** (USPN 5,421,009).

Claim 25

Balasubramaniam disclosed a method in a client of launching a software component, the client having an execution environment, the method comprising:

receiving from a user a request to launch the software component *(column 5, lines 60-61; column 6, lines 1-2)*;

sending to a server a request to launch the software component *(column 5, lines 60-61)*;

in response to sending the request, receiving from the server a launch

page that includes code to request downloading of the software component

configured based on the determined parameters *(column 6, lines 47-51)*; and

under control of the code of the received launch page,

determining whether the software component can successfully

execute in the execution environment of the client *(column 6, lines 47-51)*;

when it is determined that the software component can

successfully execute in the execution environment of the client *(column 6, lines

47-51)*,

determining parameters of the execution environment of the

client *(column 6, lines 47-51)*;

sending to the server a request to download the software

component, the request indicating the determined parameters *(column 6, lines

47-51)*;

receiving from the server the software component configured

according to the determined parameters *(column 6, lines 47-51)*; and

launching execution of the software component *(column 6, lines 62-

65)*.

Balasubramaniam did not explicitly state "determine parameters of the

execution environment of the client". **Platt** demonstrated that it was known at

the time of invention to determine parameters of an execution environment for

and for printing error messages when conditions are not appropriate (figure 8).
It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of
invention to implement the web page of **Balasubramaniam** with such code for
determination of environment and printing error messages as found in **Platt**'s
teaching. This implementation would have been obvious because one of
ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to further automate the process
and alleviate the user from difficult technical determinations (**Platt**: column 1,
lines 45-55; and **Balasubramaniam**: column 5, lines 60-62).

Claim 26

Balasubramaniam disclosed the method of claim 25 wherein the determining
of whether the software component can successfully execute in the execution
environment of the client includes determining whether a certain scripting
language is supported *(figure 3, line 10, "SCRITP LANGUAGE="JavaScript"")*.

Claim 27

Balasubramaniam disclosed the method of claim 25 wherein the determining
of whether the software component can successfully execute in the execution
environment of the client includes determining whether the software
component can be downloaded from the server *(column 6, lines 55-59).*

Claim 28

Balasubramaniam disclosed the method of claim 27 wherein the determining

of whether the software component can be downloaded includes attempting to

download from the server a test component _(column 6, lines 55-59)._

Claim 29

Balasubramaniam disclosed the method of claim 25 wherein the determining

of whether the software component can successfully execute in the execution

environment of the client includes determining whether a browser is enabled to

execute code in a certain language _(figure 3, line 10, "SCRITP_

LANGUAGE="JavaScript"").

Claim 30

Balasubramaniam disclosed the method of claim 25 including when it is

determined that the software component can successfully execute in the

execution environment of the client, establishing a connection between the

client and the server _(column 6, lines 47-51, then it is downloaded)._

Claim 31

Balasubramaniam disclosed the method of claim 25 including after sending to

the server a request to download the software component, receiving from the

server application content _(column 6, lines 47-51)._

Claim 32

Balasubramaniam disclosed the method of claim 25 including after receiving

from the server the software component configured according to the determined

parameters, executing code to detect changes in a parameter of the execution

environment of the client and when a change is detected, notifying the server of

the change to the parameter so that the server can effect the re-configuring of

the software component *(column 6, lines 52-54, component now updated and*

maintained whenever visiting server).

Claim 33

Balasubramaniam disclosed the method of claim 25 wherein a parameter of

the execution environment of the claim indicates whether a browser has certain

plug-ins *(column 6, lines 15-37).*

Claim 34

Balasubramaniam disclosed the method of claim 25 wherein a parameter of

the execution environment of the client relates to a security policy of the client

(column 6, lines 4-6, browser detection indicates security of that type of browser).

Claim 35

Balasubramaniam disclosed the method of claim 25 wherein a parameter of

the execution environment of the client relates to a hardware configuration of

the client *(column 6, lines 4-6, browser detection indicates hardware*

configuration able to support such a browser).

Claims 36-43

The limitations of claims 36-43 correspond to the limitations of claims 25-32

and are rejected in the same manner.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-43 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. As there is a

new ground of rejection the Office Action is <u>not</u> final.

Applicant's arguments filed 04 February 2008 have been fully considered

but they are not persuasive. Applicant's interpretation of the previous Office

Action's position is incorrect. The previous Office Action indicated the claims

to be rejected in view of **Balasubramaniam** and **Platt**. The previous Office

Action stated:

> It is noted for further clarity that web pages of **Balasubramaniam**
> contains the software components. Thus, if a web page with a
> particular software component is launched, the component is also
> launched. Further, if a web page with a component is requested,
> the component is also requested. A component is configured based

upon parameters at least in that the component is downloaded for a particularly chosen installation based upon such parameters.

To further clarify, **Balasubramaniam** discloses requesting a web page which contains software components and thus by requesting such a web page, the software components are themselves are requested. Further, the web pages once retrieved provide the launch page for determining parameters/compatibility/further needed components. Applicant is incorrect in stating the web pages are the software components. The second page determines if a software component can execute by requiring information before downloading. Clearly, without the information being provided the additional components cannot be downloaded and execution cannot occur. Having addressed Applicant's concerns, the rejections are maintained as indicated.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Wood whose telephone number is (571)-272-3736. The examiner can normally be reached 10:00am - 4:00pm Tuesday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis A. Bullock Jr. can be reached on (571)-272-3759. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571)273-8300 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained form either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR systems, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. For questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

/William H. Wood/
William H. Wood
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2193
April 16, 2008